

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION
CIVIL CASE NO. 5:16-cv-00302-RE

In re: CELESTE G. BROUGHTON,

Debtor.

)
)
)
)
)

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the Debtor's "Objection to 4 Orders of Judge Reidinger Rule 9023" [DE-543], which the Court construes as a motion for reconsideration, and the Debtor's "Motion to Deem Document to be Timely Filed" [DE-545].

In her "Objection," the Debtor continues her practice of giving no recognition to the prior Orders of this Court. For instance, Judge Aron's Order regarding the Debtor's claim of exemptions is summarily dismissed by the Debtor because "Judge Aron . . . fraudulently refused to even acknowledge [a particular] phrase of the statute...." [DE-544 at 3]. The Debtor goes on to assert that she "did not appeal that Order, [because it] was obviously fraudulent...." [Id.]. The Debtor then dismisses the finality of that Order because "[i]t is well settled law that a fraudulent order can never be res judicata." [Id. at 4]. In short, everything the Debtor disagrees with she deems a fraud and then expresses that it obviously does not bind her.

There are, however, rules and procedures for setting aside an order, either by appeal or by limited other means. The Debtor is not exempt from those requirements. She has, however, failed to meet any of them. Therefore, there is nothing properly before this Court to justify setting aside any of the orders of which the Debtor complains.¹

After careful consideration of the Debtor's Objection, the Court finds no basis in fact or law to reconsider or modify its prior Orders. Accordingly, the Debtor's request for reconsideration is denied.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Debtor's "Motion to Deem Document to be Timely Filed" [DE-545] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Debtor's "Objection to 4 Orders of Judge Reidinger Rule 9023" [DE-543] is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Entered this the 2 day of October, 2018.



MARTIN REIDINGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ It should be noted that the Debtor neither appealed any of these Orders nor moved to set them aside. She merely objected. Her objection does not even contain a prayer for relief setting forth the relief she seeks. Notwithstanding the Debtor's procedural failings, the Court finds no basis in law for disturbing any of the Orders at issue.